

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of CHRISTOPHER J. MORRIS,  
Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a  
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

UNPUBLISHED  
June 22, 2006

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CONSTANCE MORRIS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CHRISTOPHER DALE,

Respondent.

---

No. 266268  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 00-386457-NA

Before: Davis, P.J., and Sawyer and Schuette, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The condition leading to adjudication was educational neglect caused by respondent-appellant's paranoia and distrust of others. During the five-year course of this proceeding, respondent-appellant obtained therapy at times but did not rectify her psychological issues, which also caused her to have difficulty cooperating with the agency.

The evidence clearly showed that respondent-appellant moved often, failed to enroll the minor child in school or failed to facilitate his attendance if he was enrolled, and failed to adequately home school him. In addition, the minor child's socialization and personality were negatively affected by the environment provided by respondent-appellant. Placement with the

child's father failed in part because of interference by respondent-appellant. When the child was reunited with respondent-appellant during the fourth year of court involvement, she forthwith removed him from school and thereafter again neglected his education. One week before the termination hearing, the child truanted from his foster home, rendering long-term foster care an unavailable option to termination of parental rights.

For more than five years, respondent-appellant was unable to rectify the psychological issues that made her unable to provide a stable, nurturing environment. Her inability was due in part to the distrust inherent in her psychological profile but, whether with regard to or without regard to intent, respondent-appellant did not become able, and was not reasonably likely to become able within a reasonable time, to provide proper care or custody of the minor child. The minor child would be educationally and psychologically harmed if returned to respondent-appellant.

Affirmed.

/s/ Alton T. Davis  
/s/ David H. Sawyer  
/s/ Bill Schuette